UNITED STATES PEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Eacht and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,106	07/22/2005	Stephen Robert Wedge	056291-5210	4352
9629 7590 10/23/2007 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			EXAMINER	
			STONE, CHR	STONE, CHRISTOPHER R
WASHINGIC	ON, DC 20004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4173	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/543,106	WEDGE ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Christopher R. Stone	4173			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	VIS SET TO EVOIDE 2 MON	ITH(S) OD THIDTY (30) DAVS			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Downsions of 37 CFR 1.1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Disperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period oure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS a, cause the application to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Ju	<u>uly 2005</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
·	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.					
· · · · ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•			
اـــاره	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b)☐ objected to by	the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
441	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Of	ffice Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	•				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document					
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	• • •				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eived in this National Stage			
* (application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • •	raived			
·	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified cobies flot tec	civou.			
			*			
Attachmen 1) Notice	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	منت معلما السالم	man/ (PTO 412)			
2) Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Ma	mary (PTO-413) ail Date			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>1 page</u> .	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	mal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 and 35 USC § 101

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-7 provide for the use of ZD6474 in the manufacture of a medicament, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Art Unit: 4173

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennequin et al (WO 01/32651, provided by Applicant).

Claims 8-14 are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition and kit comprising ZD6474 and 5-FU and/or CPT-11 and a method of treating cancer, comprising administering said composition.

Hennequin et al discloses a method for the treatment of cancer in a warm-blooded animal (p. 1, lines 1-6 and p.28, lines 11-17), which comprises administering a compound of formula I (p. 3). ZD6474 is specifically identified as a compound of Formula I (claim 8). Hennequin et al further teaches combining ZD6474 with additional

antineoplastic drugs including 5-FU and CPT-11 (irinotecan) and combinations thereof and that combination therapy is normal practice in the field of medical oncology (p. 26, lines 22-27 and p. 27, lines 20-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to administer ZD6474 with 5-FU and/or CPT-11, thus resulting in the practice of the instantly claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

Furthermore, combining ZD6474 and 5-FU and/or CPT-11 into a pharmaceutical composition or kit would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, since all three compounds were known chemotherapeutic agents.

Applicant is reminded of in re Kerkhoven, which affirmed that "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980)

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Stone whose telephone number is (571) 270-3494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-4:00pm EST.

Application/Control Number: 10/543,106

Art Unit: 4173

Page 5

supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

16October2007 CRS

> CECILIA TSANG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER